REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-5 and 9-12 have been amended, and claim 7 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, at pg. 10, lines 7-15 of the Specification. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,225 (hereinafter "Schofield"), in view of "Applied Operating System Concepts" by Silberschatz et al. (hereinafter "Silberschatz"). Claim 7 has been canceled rendering the rejection of this claim moot. The rejection of the other claims is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action does not reject claims 6 and 13. However, the Office Action addresses claims 6 and 13 on page 6 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants assume that claims 6 and 13 are rejected over Schofield in view of Silberschatz.

Claims 1-5 have been amended to include "the software object can realize the hardware interface by using only the second interface definition language," or a similar feature. Claims 9-12 have been amended to include "wherein the client interface circuit realizes the interface by using another interface definition language," or a similar feature.

Schofield and Silberschatz, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest these features. Schofield discloses a method for making transport independent distributed object calls. The method involves generating an ASCII string description of an interface and creating a data structure from the string description containing information about the interface and its related operations. (See col. 3, lines 50-54). Both a server and a client generate their own respective data structures and transfer these data structures between one another in a predetermined format that is known to both the client and the server. Thus, an object call made by a client to a server is independent of transport. (See col. 4, lines 11-13).

However, Schofield fails to disclose "the software object can realize the hardware interface by using only the second interface definition language," as called for by claims 1-5. In Schofield, the data structures generated by the client and the server are based on the same interface definition language. Further, for at least the same reasons, Schofield fails to teach or suggest "wherein the client interface circuit realizes the interface by using another interface definition language," as called for by claims 9-12.

Further, Silberschatz fails to provide that which Schofield lacks. The Office Action asserts that Silberschatz teaches that objects may be hardware objects. However, Silberschatz fails to disclose a software object or a client interface circuit realizing a hardware interface using an interface definition language that is different from the interface definition language used to define the interface.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Srikant Viswanadham
Registration No. 60,111

JAO:SQV/hjr

Attachment:
    Request for Continued Examination

Date: December 19, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461